c) **Remarks:**

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 7, 2008. Claims 28-38 are presented for examination. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Former claims 18-27 were rejected under Rule 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for the reasons expressed on pages 2-4 of the Official Action.

In order to resolve the informalities noted and to address each of the issues raised by the Examiner, Claims 18-27 have been rewritten as new claims 28-38 to be more definitive, taking into account each of the Examiner's stated concerns. Support for the amendments to the claims is found, *inter alia*, in Examples 2 and 3. It is believed the informalities have been resolved. If not, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned to expedite resolution of the issues.

It is acknowledged that a search of the art has not been conducted for the previous claims 18-27. In the Official Action dated July 26, 2007 former claims 18-27 were rejected as unpatentable over Fukuda '130. Since it is believed the present claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, applicants also wish to distinguish them from Fukuda '130.

Applicants initially wish to discuss certain key features and advantages of the present claimed invention.

As shown in Figs. 8 and 9 the multicolor light-emitting device defined in claim 28 includes a first electrode arranged on the side of reflected light. Since the first electrode is closer to the substrate, light is not extracted from the substrate, but is extracted from the second electrode, which is farther from the substrate.

As seen for example in Figs. 6A and 6B the light-emitting region in the electroluminescence layer of one organic electroluminescence device is on the first electrode side and the light-emitting region in the electroluminescence layer of the other organic electroluminescence device is on the second electrode side.

The organic electroluminescence device defined in claim 28 has the above features which are not disclosed in Fukuda. In the organic electroluminescence device of the present claimed invention, the light-emitting region in the electroluminescence layer is present on

the first electrode side or the second electrode side, depending on carrier transporting property of the electroluminescence layer. The carrier transporting property of the electroluminescence layer is different for each emitted light.

The light-emitting region in the first organic electroluminescence device is closer to the first electrode in the electroluminescence layer and the light-emitting region in the second organic electroluminescence device is closer to the second electrode in the electroluminescence layer. That is, the respective light-emitting regions are in different positions. In other words, when the respective light-emitting regions of two organic electroluminescence devices arranged on the same substrate are compared to each other, since the carrier transporting property of the respective light-emitting regions are different, the light-emitting region in one electroluminescence layer is closer to the first electrode in the electroluminescence device, and the light-emitting region in the other electroluminescence layer is closer to the second electrode in the electroluminescence device.

These features are specifically disclosed in Examples 2 and 3 of the present application. The Examples disclose that a distance between a light-emitting region (which emits longer wavelength light) and the first electrode is longer than the distance between a light-emitting region (which emits light of a shorter wavelength)and the first electrode.

Fukuda merely discloses a multicolor light-emitting device having organic electroluminescence devices that emit different colors. Further, Fukuda discloses that a thickness of the hole transporting layer is different for each color to optimize optical distance. However, Fukuda neither understands or suggests that the light-emitting region in the electroluminescence layer is present either on the first electrode side or the second electrode side based on the difference in carrier transporting property of the electroluminescence layer.

Fukuda merely discloses that a thickness of the hole transporting layer is optimized to optimize an optical distance. Fukuda fails to take into account the electroluminescence layer. Fukuda discloses only that an electroluminescence layer having the same kind of carrier transporting property is used. The Examiner has cited column 11, lines 22 to 59 and column 13, lines 42 to 50 of Fukuda. However, Fukuda fails to disclose the use of an electroluminescence layer having a different kind of carrier transporting property.

Fukuda neither discloses nor suggests that individual light-emitting regions which emit light of different colors are located differently within the electroluminescence layer. The claims have been clarified to provide that each device in the array has an individual light-emitting region which emits light of a different color and is spaced at a position closer or farther from the first electrode than others. Fukuda merely shows a device in which each of the light-emitting regions emitting light of a different color is located at a position close to an electrode on a side close to a substrate.

Accordingly, since Fukuda is clearly different from the present invention, the amended claims are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Fukuda.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Peter Saxon/
Peter Saxon
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 24,947

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2079906v1